

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of:

Confirmation No.: 6889

Theodorus Suibertus Anthonius Rolf

Date: November 15, 2010

Serial No.: 10/552,027

Group Art Unit: 3711

Filed: October 3, 2005

Examiner: Amir Arie Klayman

For: TOY BUILDING BLOCK

VIA EFS-WEB

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Sir:

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the courtesy of Examiner Klayman and Supervisory Examiner Kim in granting a telephone interview with Applicants undersigned representative, held Tuesday, November 9, 2010. The following is a brief summary of that interview.

Applicant refers to the proposed Interview Agenda filed by fax with the Examiner in advance of the interview, and refers herein to the points on which agreement was reached.

With respect to independent claim 17, Applicant argued that Kushner fails to teach or suggest, as recited in the final paragraph of claim 17, that at least one of at least three zones of contact is a land in the recess of another such block engageable in a groove in the stud. Applicant refers to Examiner's annotation of Kushner at page 5 of the most recent Office Action indicating his interpretation of the groove as some portion of the projection 31 connecting adjacent studs 10. By contrast, with reference to Kushner Figure 5, there is no zone of contact which occupies the area cited in the Office Action as the groove. In the interview, Examiner expanded upon his view, specifically that an exterior portion 21 of the tube 20 fit within the stud. In further discussion it was agreed that an amendment to claim 17 which clarified the feature such that "at least one of the zones is a land in the recess of another of the blocks engageable in a groove one of said grooves in the stud" patentably distinguished over Kushner. This amendment clarified that the groove being referred to was one of said interspersed rounded grooves previously recited in claim 17.

As to claim 26, Applicant argued that De Pieri does not teach or suggest a slot across the lateral outer face, but merely a slot along an edge of the outer face. It was agreed that further amendment to claim 26 reciting “with slots across penetrating the lateral outer face” would patentably distinguish over the proposed combination including De Pieri.

With regard to claim 27, Applicant argued that Garpow did not teach or suggest recesses of the kind described in underlying independent claim 17 on both a top surface and a bottom surface. It was further agreed that claim 27 amended to recite “at least one of the recesses on at ~~least one of the~~ top surface and the bottom surface” would patentably distinguish over the proposed combination including Garpow.

Examiners indicated that the amendments contemplated above would require further consideration and/or search, and could not be entered after Final Rejection. No further agreement was reached.

THIS CORRESPONDENCE IS BEING
SUBMITTED ELECTRONICALLY
THROUGH THE PATENT AND
TRADEMARK OFFICE EFS FILING
SYSTEM ON November 15, 2010.

RCF/DJT:lf

Respectfully submitted,



David J. Torrente
Registration No.: 49,099
OSTROLENK FABER LLP
1180 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-8403
Telephone: (212) 382-0700